

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

RICHARD MUNCH, Individually and on
Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

SPROUT SOCIAL, INC., JUSTYN
HOWARD, RYAN BARRETTO, and JOE
DEL PRETO,

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:24-cv-03867

Hon. Jeffrey I. Cummings

CLASS ACTION

CITY OF HOLLYWOOD POLICE
OFFICERS' RETIREMENT SYSTEM,
Individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

SPROUT SOCIAL, INC., JUSTYN
HOWARD, RYAN BARRETTO, and JOE
DEL PRETO,

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:24-cv-05582

Hon. Jeffrey I. Cummings

CLASS ACTION

Consolidated Cases

**DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AN OVERLENGTH
REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION TO DISMISS**

NOW COME Defendants Sprout Social, Inc, Justyn Howard, Ryan Barretto, Joe Del Preto, and Jason Rechel, by and through their attorneys, respectfully requesting leave to file a Reply Brief of 30 pages in support of their Motion to Dismiss. In support of this Motion, Defendants state as follows:

1. On January 24, 2025, Plaintiff filed the Consolidated Class Action Complaint (“CAC”) in this action. It contained 305 paragraphs and is 128 pages. It alleged a purported fraud scheme that spans over a three-year period. The CAC named five different defendants—four individual defendants and one corporate defendant—and alleged that the individual defendants made dozens of supposed false and misleading statements in violation of the federal securities laws.

2. On April 1, 2025, the Court granted Defendants’ unopposed motion to file a 50-page brief in support of their Motion to Dismiss the CAC.

3. On June 13, 2025, the Court granted Lead Plaintiff’s unopposed motion to file a 50-page response brief in opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss.

4. In light of the breadth and length of this briefing, Defendants were unable in good faith to keep their reply brief within the 15-page limit, as specified by Local Rule 7.1, and required thirty pages to fully and fairly address the issues before the Court.

5. Accordingly, Defendants respectfully request permission to file a 30-page Reply Brief in support of their Motion to Dismiss.

6. As required by Local Rule 7.1, the oversized Brief includes a Table of Contents and Table of Authorities to aid the Court and Plaintiff in reviewing the filing.

7. Defendants’ counsel consulted with Plaintiff’s counsel concerning this request, and Plaintiff takes no position on Defendants’ Motion.

8. WHEREFORE, Defendants respectfully request that the Court grant this Motion.

Dated: July 10, 2025

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

By: /s/ Dane Drobny
Dane Drobny
35 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60601-9703
Telephone: (312) 558-5600
Email: ddrobny@winston.com

Matthew L. DiRisio (*pro hac vice*)
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
Telephone: (212) 294-4686
Email: mdirisio@winston.com

Counsel for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion for Leave to File Overlength Reply Brief in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss was filed electronically with the Clerk of the Court and served on all counsel of record via CM/ECF system on July 10, 2025.

/s/ Dane Drobny
Dane Drobny